



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/384,456	02/02/1995	BENGT Y. PERSSON	4015-5054	9408

24112 7590 06/06/2003

COATS & BENNETT, PLLC
P O BOX 5
RALEIGH, NC 27602

EXAMINER

VO, NGUYEN THANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2685

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2003

50

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

10

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/384,456

Applicant(s)

PERSSON ET AL.

Examiner

Nguyen T Vo

Art Unit

2685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,53-102 and 109-125 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 and 53-101 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 102 and 109-125 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group V in Paper No. 47 is acknowledged.
2. This application claims priority under 35 USC 120 from U.S. application 07/628,359 filed December 17 1990. The claims 102, 109-125 of the present application, however, are not supported by the above U.S. application 07/628,359. Accordingly, the present application does **not** benefit the earlier filing date of the above U.S. application 07/628,359.

The filing date of the present application will be April 17, 1992.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
4. Claim 113 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As to claim 113, the original specification fails to disclose during handover, temporarily decoding a transmit signal sent from said mobile station **using said first**

CDMA spreading code at both said first and second base stations for dual diversity combining of said transmit signal from said mobile station, as recited in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 102, 109, 111-112, 114-115, 117-118, 120-125 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Blakeney (5,267,261).

As to claim 102, Blakeney discloses a method of mobile-assisted handover in a wireless network comprising communicating with a mobile station from a first base station (see column 26 lines 44-46); receiving, at a network controller, one or more data messages sent from said mobile station to said first base station that indicate relative signal strengths of at least a second base station operating on a same frequency as said first base station (column 26 lines 47-57. See also column 5 lines 14-21 which discloses that the mobile station does not need to switch frequencies when handoff of the call; therefore, the first and second base station uses the same frequency as claimed); determining, by said network controller, to handover said mobile station from said first base station to said second base station based on said signal strengths (see column 26, line 59 to column 27 line 47); and handing over said mobile station from said

first base station to said second base station based on said determination by said network controller (see column 26 line 59 to column 27 line 47).

As to claim 109, Blakeney discloses handing over said mobile station comprises a same frequency soft handover from said first base station to said second base station (see column 5 lines 10-21, lines 47-56).

As to claim 111, Blakeney discloses temporarily transmitting data to said mobile station from said first base station using a first CDMA spreading code, and simultaneously transmitting the same data to said mobile station from said second base station using a second CDMA spreading code for diversity transmission to said mobile station (in this case, a same PN spreading code with different code phase offsets as disclosed at column 6 lines 17-29 read on first CDMA spreading code and second CDMA spreading code as claimed. See also column 11 lines 1-21).

As to claim 112, Blakeney discloses that the mobile station communicates with said first base station using a first CDMA spreading code before and during handover, and wherein said mobile station communicates with said second base station using a second CDMA spreading code during and after handover (in this case, a same PN spreading code with different code phase offsets as disclosed at column 6 lines 17-29 read on first CDMA spreading code and second CDMA spreading code as claimed. See also column 11 lines 1-21; column 27 lines 1-47), and further comprising sending a control message from said first base station to said mobile station that identifies said second CDMA spreading code to support handover of said mobile station (see column 26 line 67 to column 27 line 12).

As to claim 114, Blakeney discloses during handover, temporarily decoding transmit signals sent from said mobile station using said first and second CDMA spreading codes at both said first and second base stations for quadruple diversity combining of said transmit signals from said mobile station (in this case, a same PN spreading code with different code phase offsets as disclosed at column 6 lines 17-29 read on first CDMA spreading code and second CDMA spreading code as claimed. See also column 11 lines 22-38).

As to claim 115, Blakeney discloses that handing over said mobile station comprises establishing communications with said mobile station from said second base station while retaining control of said mobile station at said first base station, and transferring control of said mobile station to said second base station after said establishing communications with said mobile station from said second base station (see column 10 lines 26-37; column 27 lines 1-47).

As to claim 117, Blakeney discloses that transferring control includes forming power control commands for transmission to said mobile station at said first base station prior to transferring control of said mobile station, and forming power control commands for transmission to said mobile station at said second base station after transferring control of said mobile station, wherein said power control commands control a transmit power of said mobile station (see column 12 lines 49-60; column 29 lines 36-53).

As to claim 118, Blakeney discloses that establishing communications with said mobile station from said second base station comprises: beginning transmissions from said second base station to said mobile station (see column 26 lines 59-66); signaling

said mobile station from said first base station to begin receiving said transmissions from said second base station (see column 26 line 67 to column 27 line 12); receiving signaling from said mobile station at said first base station indicating a received signal strength of transmissions from said second base station (see column 27 lines 19-26); and signaling said mobile station from said first base station to begin transmitting to said second base station and to begin responding to control signaling from said second base station after determining that said mobile station is receiving transmissions from said second base station at a sufficient signal strength (see column 27 lines 30-46).

As to claim 120, Blakeney discloses that sending a control message to said mobile station via said first base station that identifies a CDMA spreading code used by said second base station to transmit to said mobile station (see column 26 line 67 to column 27 line 12).

As to claim 121, Blakeney discloses receiving one or more data messages indicating a received signal strength of said transmissions to said mobile station from said second base station (see column 27 lines 13-29).

As to claim 122, Blakeney discloses retaining an existing connection for said mobile station at said first base station while establishing a new connection for said mobile station at said second base station, and ending said existing connection at said first base station after determining that said new connection at said second base station is established (see column 10 lines 26-37; column 27 lines 1-47).

As to claim 123, Blakeney discloses continuing to transmit traffic and control signals to said mobile station from said first base station and continuing to receive traffic

and control signals from said mobile station at said first base station (see column 10 lines 26-37; column 27 lines 1-47).

As to claim 124, Blakeney discloses continuing to send power control commands to said mobile station from said first base station to continue controlling a transmit power of said mobile station from said first base station at least until said new connection is established at said second base station (see column 10 lines 25-37; column 27 lines 13-46; column 29 lines 36-53).

As to claim 125, it is rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 118 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claim 110 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakeney in view of Farwell (5,184,347).

As to claim 110, Blakeney fails to disclose a different frequency hard handover as claimed. Farwell discloses a different frequency hard handover in a CDMA system (see column 41 line 64 to column 42 line 68). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Farwell to Blakeney, so that the call would not be interrupted when the mobile station moves to a second base station which operates on at least one different frequency (as suggested by Farwell).

10. Claims 116, 119 are is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakeney in view of Hietala (5,150,075).

As to claim 116, Blakeney does disclose handing over said mobile station further comprises ending communications with said mobile station from said first base station after said establishing communications with said mobile station from said second base station as claimed (see column 10 lines 26-37; column 27 lines 1-47). However, Blakeney fails to disclose ending communications with said mobile station from said first base station by ramping down a transmit signal for said mobile station to a low power level, wherein said ramping down is controlled to reduce disturbances to any other mobile stations communicating with said first base station as claimed. Hietala discloses ramping down a transmit signal to a low power level, wherein ramping down is controlled to reduce disturbances to any other mobile stations (see column 1 lines 59-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to provide the above teaching of Hietala to Blakeney, in order to reduce disturbances to any other mobile stations (as suggested by Hietala at column 1 lines 59-65).

As to claim 119, it is rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 116 above.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nguyen T Vo whose telephone number is (703) 308-6728. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday and alternate Monday from 8:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on (703)305-4385. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for all communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Nguyen Vo

May 26, 2003



**NGUYEN T. VO
PRIMARY EXAMINER**